

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 12-19 are pending in this application, with claims 12 and 15 being the only independent claims. Claims 12 and 15 are amended. Claims 20-22 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-11 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 12-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, because the Examiner alleges that the limitation “the internal addresses being of the type that should not be found by a public system, the internal addresses of internal elements including network addresses of access points of the second operator network”, is not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed. While Applicants disagree with the Examiner’s assessment, Applicants have previously amended the claims to cancel the rejected subject matter in the response filed on February 6, 2012. Accordingly, the rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph should be withdrawn.

Claims 12-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The rejected subject matter has been canceled from the claims.

Claims 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because claim 20 is narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. Although Applicants disagree with the Examiner’s rejection, Applicants have previously canceled claims 20-22. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 20-22 is now moot.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 12-16, 20 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,277,453 (Chin) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,016,512 (Huitema) in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0218611 (Kim) and in view of US. Patent No. 7,554,991 (Sbida).

Claims 17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Chin, Huitema, Kim, and Sbida and further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0133775 (Callas).

Claims 18-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over as unpatentable over Chin, Huitema, Kim, and Sbida and further in view of WO 2005/069663 (Laurila).

Independent claim 12, as amended, now recites “transmitting the query from the first name server to the second name server of the second operator network, the second name server is part of the second operator network and does not directly belong to an interface network or a public internet, the second name server being a private name server including network addresses of access points of the second operator network, whereby the first network operator is required only to know the address of the second name server for data transmission with subscribers of the second operator network”, “determining the network address of the required access point in the second name server”, “after receiving the network address of the required access point from the second name server, transmitting, by the first name server, a query response including only the network address of the required access point to the control element of the first operator network”, and “setting up a connection from the control element of the first operator network to the required access point of the second network on the basis of the network address of the required access point in the query response, the required access point of the second network routing messages originated from the first operator network to an intended network address in the second network.”

Claim 12 now clarifies that the second name server is part of the second operator network and does not directly belong to an interface network or a public internet, the second name server being a private name server including network addresses of access points of the second operator network, whereby the first network operator is required only to know the address of the second name server for data transmission with subscribers of the second operator network. Support for this limitation is found in original application as filed at page 6, lines 28-34.

In addition, the required information from the second server is an address of an access point in the receiving network, i.e., the operator network B, and not the intended network address of the message. As expressly stated in claim 12, the access point routes messages to the intended network address.

The combination of Chin, Huitema, Kim, and Sbida fails to disclose the above limitations because (1) Chin discloses determining an address of the intended address for the message and (2) the element of Chin considered by the Examiner to be the claimed second name server is part of an interface network.

Chin discloses network communications between IPv4 hosts using IPv6. According to Chin, IPv4 hosts are associated with IPv6 addresses. Chin discloses an application-level gateway of a domain name server (DNS-ALG) at col. 5, lines 16-34. The DNS-ALG is capable of being coupled to a gateway having a domain name system (DNS) server. The DNS-ALG detects a need for communications between a first IPv4 host in a second private network via the global network using IPv6 packets. A virtual table is coupled to the DNS-ALG for storing a mapping between IPv4 and IPv6 addresses of one of the first and second IPv4 hosts (col. 5, lines 26-28).

Fig. 2 of Chin discloses an embodiment in which a home network-A 210 is connected to a home network-B 220 via a global network 230 (col. 12, lines 1-4 of Chin). Host H-1A of home network A and host H-1B of home network B register their private addresses with a respective DNS server running gateway-A 214 and gateway-B 264, respectively (col. 12, lines 63-65). In col. 13, starting at line 7, Chin describes that a communication channel is established between the two hosts. The described procedure includes interrogating the gateways for the address of the host. There is no disclosure in Chin of querying for an access point, which is used to route messages to the hosts.

The Examiner states in the office action that the step of querying for the access point is disclosed at col. 13 of Chin. However, this portion of Chin discloses a query for the host address and does not query any database for an access point that is used to route message originated from the first network to an intended address in the second network. Since the claimed access point is not the ultimate intended address of the communication, but is only an access point for the communication in the second network, and since Chin discloses only a query for a host, Chin fails to disclose the private name server as recited in independent claim 12.

Moreover, the DNS-ALG of Chin is part of a gateway 214 or 264 and is thus part of an interface network. The claimed second name server is not part of the interface circuit or public internet. In fact, according to Fig. 2 of Chin, the gateway A and B could be considered part of the internet. Thus, the DNS-ALG of Chin does not teach or suggest the second name server, as now claimed.

The other references cited in the rejection, Huitema, Kim, Sbida, Callas, Laurila also fail to disclose the above-cited claimed features.

Therefore, none of the documents independently or in combination teaches or suggests the limitations of independent claim 12.

Claim 15 is allowable for the same reasons as is independent claim 12.

Dependent claims 13-14, 16-19, and 21-22 are allowable for the same reasons as are independent claims 12, 15, and 20, as well as for the additional recitations contained therein.

The application is now deemed to be in condition for allowance, and early notice to that effect is solicited.

Should the Examiner have any remaining comments, questions, suggestions, or objections, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned in order to resolve any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,
COZEN O'CONNOR

By /Alfred W. Froeblich/
Alfred W. Froeblich
Reg. No. 38,887
277 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10172
(212) 883-4900

Dated: April 4, 2012